



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0917CA-1 for Fullerton Elementary School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application presents a comprehensive and coherent reform vision, described in sufficient detail to visualize the new classroom buzzing with personalized learning activities and teacher support.</p> <p>The district has adopted the Common Core State Standards and developed an active planning commission to lead implementation. The application notes that the common core standards will be integrated with the personalized learning activities and the Challenge Based learning activities to deepen understanding and critical thinking skills.</p> <p>The district details extensive experience with data systems to measure student growth and inform education decisions along with an ambitious vision for the next generation system. The comprehensive new and improved data system will manage progress data and suggest learning resources based on student performance data as well as mapping achievement indicators backward and forward.</p> <p>The narrative presents support systems in place to develop effective teachers and principals through PLCs, release time for professional development and data analysis, research based training through Marzano Research Lab, 21st Century Skills training and certificate qualifying modules. The vision also briefly references the successful redesign of the teacher and principal evaluation systems. The narrative notes very high application submission for teacher or administrative opening, which provides access to most effective teachers and principals. Struggling teachers are supported by successful peers in effort to improve.</p> <p>The applicant provides compelling evidence of its success in turning around its two lowest achieving schools as evidenced by one school's exit from Program Improvement, Year 5 and both schools earning multiple distinguished awards for their significant turnaround. Staff commitment and longevity is noted in these schools, providing stability.</p> <p>The applicant addressed the criteria with a thorough and convincing approach and vision.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>All of the TK-8 grade schools will participate in the RTT project. based on the district's commitment to district-wide reform. The district also presents a sound plan for phasing in the program, starting with the youngest grade in each grade band so that no child will experience a technology gap in future years. An appropriate education technology support system is also noted to ensure a high-quality LEA and school-level implementation of the proposal.</p> <p>The applicant provides the total number of participating students, participating high-need students and the number of students from low-income families. The applicant also provides a list of schools and the number of participating educators.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Several components of a high-quality plan are omitted in the narrative response to the criteria including a timeline, deliverables, and parties responsible reducing the overall credibility of the project implementation and scale-up success. The goals and activities are described in detail across the narrative, but not tied to the above noted additional high-quality plan components.</p>		

The applicant reinforces that all students in the TK-8 district will be served by the project and the scale-up to district-wide change is built into the rollout plan over the four year grant proposal.

The district presents its theory of change throughout the narrative, explaining how the intended activities and processes are designed to translate into improved student learning outcomes. The model is also visualized through the Fullerton School District Flex Classroom graphic focusing on the 4Cs: Communication, Collaboration, Critical Thinking and Creativity. Although the logical design for improved outcomes is clearly noted in the proposal, the specific scale-up plan does not contain sufficient detail for a high score.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

9

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district presents evidence of substantial success in similar past efforts and a current vision for expansion and improvement substantiating a high likelihood for improved student learning and performance. Committed partnerships with in-district universities and colleges provide quality opportunities to best understand college readiness and provide motivating opportunities for students to prepare for college.

The application proposes proficiency targets in ELA and math summative assessments which are ambitious but achievable goals over a three year improvement period strengthened by a increases shown in the two baseline years. The ultimate result is near 100% proficiency or better for almost all groups, with ambitious but likely achievable annual growth overall and by subgroup.

The district notes a strong commitment to decreasing achievement gaps and provides evidence of success in meeting that commitment in recent years. The performance measure goals will all but close the existing gaps.

Graduation rates and college enrollment are briefly addressed in the narrative through the context of partnerships with the higher education community to better prepare and motivate students to graduate and attend college. No explanation is provided regarding graduation rates or college enrollment, but this is likely due to the district only serving K-8 students.

Completion/promotion data for 8th grade students may have been a helpful data substitute to show program since high school graduation rates do not apply.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	14

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district presents a clear track record of success the past four years through whole-district API increases and other evidence of high overall achievement described and charted in the narrative. The district provides further evidence of success through three specific school case studies supported by data evidencing significant improvement in those schools. Fisler is showcased as the highest-achieving school in the district, with recent steady gains. Maple and Valencia Park showcase their rise from low achieving schools significantly improved schools. The proposal also describes rich experience in technology supported learning to individualize learning and create collaborative and timely demonstration of knowledge.

The three case studies data show limited or no gaps and indication of closure between the whole and EL, SED and Asian and Hispanic student subgroups. Significant gains in language arts and math are shown across the board and in the specific three example schools detailed.

The graduation and college enrollment rates are not addressed. Inclusion of a statement noting why they were not addressed as requested in the criteria would have been helpful. Assumedly, the lack of information is because it not applicable to a TK-8 district.

The district has implemented innovative and ambitious reforms in low-performing schools as evidenced through the gains made in Maple and Valencia Park schools. The proposal shows achievement gains in ELA and Math scores as well as notes significantly increased student engagement and assignment completion through student use of iOS devices. Of particular note is the dedicated implementation of RTI and iPod Reading Fluency program. Valencia Park's ELA scores increased 23% and math scores increased 22.2% between 2007//2008 and 2010/ 2011 benchmark scores. The Valencia Park data also shows gap closure in ELA and Math for Hispanic, SED and EL student subgroups; an impressive accomplishment as the entire student body made significant gains as well over the five year data table.

The district currently has multiple data systems in place where educators regularly access and analyze student learning data to

drive instruction. Significant support is provided to the teachers through district-provided certificate programs, PLCs and general technology support. Parents currently have access to their child's data through the SIS and Haiku LMS. Students also have access to their Haiku LMS information, SIS data and Illuminate Ed data warehouse to assess achievement instantaneously. The district has a clear vision and plans in collaboration with their current software vendors to build in existing data systems to develop a more comprehensive and accessible Next Generation Data System. The new system is well described to increase productivity as well as provide early indicators of instruction needs for the group or individual students and suggested resources to met the specific learning needs. The technology vision and comprehensive nature of the district's plan is both ambitious and exciting.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicants notes that all salaries for all staff, including instructional and teachers is posted on their website and published in the newspaper annually. Additional school information, including fiscal information, is posted in the School Accountability Report Cards available on the district website and the individual school websites.

The district states transparency is vitally important and further provides multiple information distribution opportunities through Board meetings, department reports and School Site Council meetings in addition to the annual Budget Advisory Committee meeting series.

The district included an example of the School Accountability Report Card which includes the total expenditure per pupil. The application did not describe if they provide non-personnel expenditures by school to the public, except as possibly available through budgeting meetings.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides significant evidence of district policy and practice to implement the personalized learning environments described in the proposal. The applicant also describes flourishing experiences implementing similar procedures across multiple schools, which conveys the district has successful conditions to implement the proposed project.

Although compliance with district policy and Federal law is noted, the application does not address whether the state laws and regulations allow sufficient autonomy to implement personalized learning environments. The State Department of Education letter is vague on the issue as well, but notes an assumption that an approved application will comply with state law. A more thorough response to current state conditions and laws would have allowed for a higher score.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Meaningful engagement in the development of and for the proposal is sparse, but described to include regular district staff meetings with different stakeholder groups who have written letters of support and understand their roles in contributing to the project. An extensive list of school, community, business and higher education partners and supporter's letters of support is provided showing strong support for the past activities of the district as a whole. The applicant further describes stakeholder engagement opportunities to include Principals sharing the grant proposal with their school foundation (as applicable).

Also noted as general planning and feedback opportunities include ongoing meetings with the education community, partners, and civic and business leaders, and district and union leadership providing past work to develop the new evaluation system. However, most of the examples cited describe past school efforts rather than the actual development of this proposal. No indication of revisions resulting from feedback is made.

Support for the project and participation in the ongoing development of the Project Innov8 by the district's three bargaining units is noted in addition to proof of support through letters from each of the bargaining units.

Involvement by students and student groups in the development of feedback regarding the proposal is missing and student are a key stakeholder group.

Evidence of actual stakeholder engagement and feedback regarding the proposal development and lack of evidence of student participation led to the limited score.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal confirms the general readiness of the district to implement personalized learning environments and describes past practice and current policy and vision to bring the project to fruition. The application also provides logic behind the reform proposal's specific activities and how each aspect leads to student improvement throughout the narrative.</p> <p>Specific technology access gaps, and staff development needs are clearly identified, with specific proportions already analyzed which need to be met for all students to receive a personalized education environment. Although the district shows clear logic for the reform, experience, and readiness to scale the personalization measures district wide, it does not provide all of the required components of a high-quality plan to address the identified needs and gaps. The components lacking to judge the overall credibility of the district plan include parties responsible, deliverables, and a timeline.</p>		

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district will use technology and existing educational exchanges and connections between students and real-world practitioners so students understand what they learn is key to success and to understand the application of knowledge is relevant to achieving their goals.</p> <p>Students will identify and pursue learning goals linked to common core through CBL to ensure a student's global view and 21st Century Skills. Teachers will receive professional development in communication, collaboration, critical thinking and creativity through Common Core standards-based activities to prepare students for life within and beyond the classroom. Information is not clear on how the students will be trained or already understand how to measure their progress toward the learning goals.</p> <p>Deep learning experiences in areas of interest will be provided to students primarily through CBL projects. The district provides a convincing example of a CBL project undertaken by at-risk students who had lost family members to cancer. The jointly researched, published a website, consulted with experts, raised cancer awareness and developed an Internet business to sell student-made wallets to raise money to donate. The learning was interest-based, authentic, deep and meaningful.</p> <p>The district provides access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and exposure to motivate and deepen learning through a culturally diverse staff, emphasis on arts education with many innovative arts exposure opportunities such as the art and music buses and access to creative professionals for student projects.</p> <p>The district will use the enhanced data system to manage the critical data and resources such as teacher developed critical academic content lessons and CBL opportunities for students to develop skills such as goal-setting, teamwork, and critical thinking. CBL activities will focus on student mastery of collaboration, creativity, critical thinking and communication for problem solving and more. The student learning process and progress will be assessed and documented through the new data system for ongoing feedback and personalized instructional adjustment.</p> <p>Each student will have access to a personalized sequence of content and skill to graduate college and career ready through the new data system which includes (with expanding resources) many formats and options to guide students through the learning process. The curriculum suggested and provided to students will be based on need as assessed through common, benchmark and state assessments. The system will level the suggested resources based on the student-demonstrated understanding and mastery. The narrative contains descriptions of a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments currently available to many of the district students which will be expanded to all students through this grant.</p> <p>The district provides training and support for teacher-created and shared, and LMS provided high-quality aligned digital content delivered through the LMS, and ultimately through the new data system. This is a novel approach of growing and sharing high-quality resources between teachers in a meaningful way which is then matched to student needs almost automatically. The resources will be analyzed for successful use by students to help rate and share resources for specific student needs.</p> <p>The district has crafted state content standards- and CCSS-based benchmark assessments for grades 5 and 8 which are loaded in the Illuminate Ed system to provide feedback to address during PLC meetings. RTI information and Illuminate Ed assessment information will be integrated in the new data system to provide individual student data used to determine progress toward standards and personalized learning recommendations based on student current knowledge and skill.</p>		

Multiple accommodations and quality strategies for high-need students to succeed and graduate are provided in addition to evidence of past success in raising achievement for high-need students in the lowest-performing schools. The district focuses significant effort on language development, implements RTI and GATE programs to support remediation and accelerated learning strategies, and most notably, partners with the Hope International University to provide the AVID program. AVID provides encouragement for graduation targeting high-need starting in 7th grade with the motivating factor of college scholarships upon graduation.

The proposal describes multiple training and support mechanisms for students, parents and teachers to use tools and resources to track and manage learning. Training and support is provided for use of the software and the hardware and the district additionally provides certified District repair center to minimize any interruption to technology access. The district will expand the innovative student-manned Innof8tion Counters to assist their peers in completing projects, provide technology support and ultimately become empowered to become technology leaders.

The applicant provided a robust and effective narrative description of how each of the criteria will be addressed or met and generally noted who is responsible for the activity. However, for this information to constitute a high-quality plan, the applicant needs to present the timeline for implementing the personalized learning environments beyond the equipment rollout.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

14

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Teachers will ensure a rigorous course of study aligned to CCSS and state content standards through each student's Innof8tion Education Plan within the NGDS to include learning style, collage and career goals, level of mastery, special needs, interests and hobbies. The plan will update whenever the system is used to provide the most relevant data and feedback. Time and learning resources as needed will be provided for each student to master their skills as evidenced through the NGDS. The personalized plans will draw attention to students need for learning support or acceleration.

Particularly impressive are the teacher-developed CBL units and the process to collect feedback from students for the success in learning based on the activity. An explanation of CBL units early in the narrative would have helped to clarify how CBL will meet many of the reform needs. CBL use will be reviewed and reflected upon during PLC meetings to adapt content and instruction for students in the next offering of the particular lesson. The teacher-designed CBL units are used to engage in common and individual tasks responsive to the students' needs, interest and learning approaches. The CBL learning strategy as described is a complex but effective learning tool to address the academic skills students need along with 21st Century and life-long career and college skills. The descriptions of the energy CBL and the Ratheon/Optomerty CBLs are very informative to understand how this learning strategy is conducted and applies to meet the RTT goals.

The district describes plans to frequently measure student progress toward standards through the NGDS with near weekly professional time in the PLCs to evaluate and discuss the student data and learning resources and practices with colleagues.

This built-in reflection time is vital to frequent analysis of the recent data to determine the next instructional moves. This is also time for teachers to share CBL units and collaborate for shared teaching opportunities. Of concern is the dependence on the PLCs to develop extensive curriculum and other tasks with access to only one early out day. The significant responsibilities for PLCs to implement the reform may not be feasibility in the time available. A timeline showing what is addressed and when would help lend credibility to the plan.

The proposal describes a focused and collaborative effort between teachers, administration and professional development providers such as Dr. Marzano to jointly remodel the teacher and principal evaluation systems to drive improvement and increase effectiveness. The letter of support from the teacher union president note the partnership and buy-in by the teachers during the remodel process has led to positive implementation of the new evaluation process. It is refreshing to hear the joint buy-in and development of a professional evaluation system with all parties striving to improve practice and education results for students based in large part on student growth. The narrative explains the process involved in developing the teacher evaluation system, but provides limited detail or examples of the evaluation document and process that will be used to evaluate teachers.

The proposal clearly explains that teachers have current access to dynamic and actionable information to identify optimal learning approaches responsive to individual student needs and interests through the current independent data systems. Their access and efficiency will be enhanced through the new NGDS and frequent meetings of the PLCs.

High-quality digital learning resources aligned to standards have been identified including several examples of third-party content, teacher created, and partner created resources. The district takes a forward thinking approach to building the new NGDS with the ability to search for appropriate material, analyze its success for helping students master standards, and the

ability for the system to suggest possible resources based on student need.

The proposal describes the processes and tools to match student needs with resources and approaches using the PLCs and RtI to develop units of study, identify and assess student needs and discuss best practices and strategies to meet those needs. The NGDS will provide the student data and also warehouses the learning resources from which to draw. The NGDS data and PLC review will culminate in the update of each students IEP.

The district describes a thorough and frequent evaluation of principals (3 x per year) by the superintendent to review information to assess and improve principal effectiveness based on their ability to improve teaching and learning and how well learning has been personalized for each students. Also necessary components, the principals must ensure rigorous learning opportunities are available for all students and to create promote parent and community involvement in support of a student-centered environment.

Principals will receive monthly intensive training and support on the technology systems and practices understand data and to continuously improve school progress to increase achievement and close achievement gaps. Principals are responsible for measuring individual and collective The Principal Goals and Objectives timeline and evaluation documents are very helpful to understand the thorough principal evaluation system and quality control measures which will be implemented during the 2012-13 school year. The district also notes the plan to develop a certificate program for principals called Leaders of Innovation supported by collaboration with peers.

Teacher support and training is best conveyed through Figure 6, the FSD Professional Development Plan. Explanation of the intensive summer training in needed along with the Innovation Specialist Trainer and Coach roles. The proposal describes the Wednesday staff development days for ongoing support and training from their principals who adjust training based on the school's specific needs. The use of reflective teacher walkthroughs in other teacher's classrooms is an exciting method to dialogue about the elements of effective teaching and student learning. An example of the 41 elements of effective teaching and student learning, or the "Becoming a Reflective Teacher" tool would be helpful to better understand the concept.

The Principal evaluation and support systems are well-documented and clearly explained, including frequency of trainings and evaluations. This same information would have improved the response for teacher evaluation design and timeline/frequency of evaluatory measures.

The district describes its current ability to provide effective teachers to its students and notes the goal now is to increasing students who receive instruction from highly effective teachers and principals; moving from "good" to "great". The plan intended to increase effectiveness includes the leadership, training, support, and resources described to improve teaching and leading as well as the continued access to a large selection of candidates to secure highly effective educators when openings occur.

Although the application addresses each of the specific numbered criteria and attempts to explain how each criteria will be met by the district's proposal, a clear plan of action with deliverables and a timeline is necessary to constitute a high-quality plan.

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The district explains that current policies, practices and infrastructure are already in place and have been used successfully in the past to fulfill implementation of the project in the future. Central office support to schools is provided through coordination with school principals to schedule regular district-wide professional development (at least once/month) and classroom learning walks. The district also provides RTI specialists and systems ensure struggling students have access to the curriculum and mastery-based advancement policies and resources to meet acceleration or additional depth of understanding needs. A district organizational chart or expanded description of the Central Office staff positions, resources and responsibilities would have strengthened the understanding of the district support structure.</p> <p>School leadership teams are provided "loose-tight" autonomy providing sufficient flexibility for or schedules, staffing, and school site budgets in addition to determining how resources are used and accountability for the outcomes. The district provides significant examples of local school leaders' ability to customize professional development, staffing, and technology coach use to meet the personalized need of their students.</p> <p>The proposal expands on the district's current policy and practices allowing student progression and credit based on mastery</p>		

through the RTT project. The enhanced NGDS will more easily and broadly assess, match, and personalize education based on mastery of carefully aligned skills through digital resources and CBL units to allow student opportunities best fitting their understanding and level. Student advancement is already based on mastery in the district; this project expands this practice.

The district clearly defines documents opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery at multiple times in multiple ways as demonstrated through the LMS assessments and through authentic CBL assessments such as audio or video journals. The LMS currently provides the ability for students to access the online standards-mastery based assessments on their own timeline for quick advancement, or continued instruction for skills not yet mastered.

Significant evidence of learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students is provided in the narrative. The district describes multiple settings, adaptations and modifications used to best meet each student's learning needs, including GATE and students with disabilities. The targeted strategies have resulted in measurable gains on the California Modified Assessment and California Alternate Performance Assessment. The thorough examples of environments and tools used to best meet students with disabilities include the district's state-of-the-art Occupational Therapy clinic and a pilot projects using a research-based computer program and many technology tools providing unique accommodations.

The applicant provides compelling evidence that the infrastructure, policies and practices are already in place, negating the need for significant future implementation planning. The only deficits in the applicants response include limited information regarding the Central Office organization/role and lack of a timeline for how the expansion of current practices shows credible support determination.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
--	----	----

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a technology-forward environment (tools and infrastructure) in all schools for all students and teachers and details exceptional access for the 1:1 laptop program schools. The district also has a plan to improve the networks access and speed over the next two years to provide services based on a more than 1 device per user ratio, which is well-planned. All students, parents and educators have access to content, tools and learning resources in and out of school through login access to the LMS, Data Warehouse and SIS. The enhancements planned to improve access, efficiency, content and interoperability across these systems will strengthen already sound technology and resource access. The district has planned a unique and important improvement in Internet access to students and parents outside of school through neighborhood and partner organization access in addition to commitments with Internet providers to expand access to low-income families. The intent to provide universal access is to be commended.

The district's plan to provide all stakeholders with appropriate technical support includes adding student "Genius Bars", increasing technology support provider positions and parent support opportunities. Multiple levels of technical support are provided for stakeholders, from online documentation to student provided support to professional technology support providers and help desk staff. Equipment repair and loan plans are in place to minimize access to digital resources. The student Genius Bar, expanded tech support hours, frequent technology support evenings and Labmercials/Road Shows provide support for parents. The plan outlined appears to be efficient and effective.

The district's enhancements to the information technology systems expand parent and students access and will allow them to import and export info to use with other learning systems. The enhancements will expand on their existing interoperability work through the Open LDAP system to provide additional interpretability between data systems.

The district has developed a comprehensive and credible plan to support project implementation through policies and infrastructure to provide stakeholders the necessary access, support and resources.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal presents a thorough evaluation plan for continuous improvement, with clearly defined goal, evaluation questions, measurable outcomes, and data collection plan and timeline. The evaluation strategies provide for timely and regular feedback on progress toward goals and evidence of institutionalization of the project between the evaluators and the project administration. Strategies for feedback from parents, a stakeholder group in the project, are not mentioned in the evaluation plan.

The evaluator intends multiple and frequent opportunities for corrections and improvements during and after grant., with meetings scheduled at least monthly. Data collection and analysis with and from most stakeholder groups is outlined with the person responsible, activity and timeline provided. The CREAL team is frequently noted in the Person Responsible column, but they are not identified as to who or what that team is.

Extensive qualitative teacher and student information will be collected from each participant in following Years 1 and 3 and the same information will be collected from sample groups following Years 2 and the conclusion of the grant. Information will also be collected from community partner members such as universities. Two-way communication opportunities will be provided through frequent focus group data collection discussions. Frequent quantitative data gathering through the school data systems and analysis with focus groups and admin group will help monitor and measure the quality of its investments funded by the grant.

Very limited information is provided regarding how the information will be shared publicly with opportunity for feedback from parents and others outside of the limited focus groups identified.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)

5

3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Ongoing communication and opportunities for engagement with internal stakeholders is evident in the evaluation plan. Examples include the monthly meetings and the annual report which will include discussion of recommendations for program improvement with the leadership group and with student and teacher focus groups. Interviews with teachers and students are also noted help measure outcomes.

Insufficient evidence is provided regarding opportunities for engagement and communication with external stakeholders. The limited opportunities outlined include the discussion forum with the annual report release, Community expert interviews, and the community engagement focus group and survey opportunity. The only evidence of a feedback and engagement opportunity open to the general public or parents is the annual report forum. No mention is noted as to how engagement or feedback from the general public will be solicited or otherwise promoted.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

0

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Performance measures were omitted.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal presents a sufficient evaluation plan for evaluating the effectiveness of grant funded activities through clearly defined, evaluation questions, measurable outcomes, and data collection plan. Strategies to be measured include efficacy of professional development effectiveness, student and teacher use of mobile technology, effectiveness of support from community partners and use of data warehouses. The new evaluation system effectiveness does not appear to be included for evaluation.

The evaluator intends multiple and frequent opportunities for data collection during and after grant., with meetings scheduled at least monthly to review the data. Data collection and analysis with and from most stakeholder groups is outlined with the person responsible, activity and timeline provided.

Extensive qualitative teacher and student information will be collected from each participant and information will also be collected from community partner members such as universities. Frequent quantitative data gathering through the school data systems and analysis with focus groups and admin group will help monitor and measure the quality of its investments funded by the grant.

Not clear is how the collected information will be responded to for opportunities for ongoing improvement by the district. The narrative is not clear for how the project team will use the evaluation data to make adjustments.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

Available

Score



(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant clearly Identified funds to support project and notes the origin of the non-grant funding sources.</p> <p>The costs appear to be appropriate and sufficient to develop and implement the project as described.</p> <p>The applicant provides clear rationale for investment and priorities requested through the grant both throughout the narrative and summarized in the budget narrative.</p> <p>The project budget explanations designate which of the requested project funds are RTT money and clearly displays any other money and notes the source of other funds.</p> <p>The last table identifies one time investments versus ongoing operational costs. However the table was obscure in that the only items designated as ongoing were personnel. The other items, including personnel benefits are not clearly labeled and therefore assumed to be one-time. A clear explanation or consistent labeling would improve the information provided.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant addressed plans for sustaining the grant funded project long after the grant ends. The district indicates that a 1:1 mobile technology plan is the goal for the future, not just for the grant period. The proposal provides thoughtful information regarding district plans for sustaining specific components of the grant throughout the narrative and reinforces the district's sustainability plan in the sustainability section.</p> <p>A novel approach to funding ongoing curriculum development and alignment is through intended licensing of the content in the enhanced LMS post-grant. The district has further identified specific existing budget sources which will resume responsibility for the necessary costs. Significant emphasis is placed on thorough professional development during the grant to grow existing staff capacity which should only require maintenance and advanced training, at a much lower cost to sustain than to build the capacity. The district notes the challenges of identifying full sustainable funding for devices post-grant, but describes the intent to work with vendors, foundations and more to solve the problem by the end of the grant.</p> <p>Several of the partner support letters indicate financial support for the district's program and beyond. The state is nonresponsive and the applicant does not provide indication of state or local government financial support for the project's sustainability. An optional extended budget is not included.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district provides evidence of a broad and committed group of entities who already provide resource alignment and integrated services to augment the schools resources.</p> <p>The proposal describes existing sustainable partnership with foundations, organizations, service providers, colleges and school representatives whose mission critical is to reach the most at-risk student populations including SED, EL, and SWD. The applicant confirms significant investment in time and money by multiple project partners and collaborative groups organized to provide needed services in support of the whole child.</p> <p>The three main population-level desired results are: 1) strong minds skilled in the four "Cs" to adapt to, design for and work successfully with others in their global environment; 2) strong bodies with physical and mental resilience and healthy lifestyle and 3) strong futures to successfully navigate college and career. A table provides the identified high-need groups to be served, type of result (community, family or educational) and the identified agency and participating to effect the listed desired results.</p> <p>The selected indicators will be tracked through multiple existing state educational assessments (standard and modified), healthy kids survey, attendance records, surveys, videos and more. The data will be stored in the NGDS for on demand viewing by the teachers to best meet their at-risk student's personalized plan. The proposal details how the teachers will use the data to target its LMS resources for students with special challenges and others, with support from the PLCs to collaborate</p>		

on best methods to meet the data-identified individual needs.

The district explains that current organizations and the district effectively currently meet the needs of all at-risk students by providing funding, materials, resources, services staff and volunteers. Referrals are made when needs are identified so that students have access to medical, dental, mental health, and housing resources. The success is evidenced in the achievement scores provided and the case study information from the highest-need schools which show gap closure and generally high proficiency rates for all students district-wide. The case studies for Valencia Park and Maple schools' turnaround efforts show significant results over time. These schools will serve as scale-up models for other schools.

The district places key staff in contact with the service providers and schools to coordinate available resources with needs.

Student development assets are tracked as part of the PBIS system implemented in most of the district schools. Additionally, the Superintendent and building principals serve as members of the collaborative to share the task of growing healthy and educated youth. The district also has a team in place to assess needs and assets of participating students through community family meetings and surveys.

The school and community needs have been identified and aligned to the project goals in the table provided in (X)(2).

Three decision-making structures provide the process and infrastructure to select, implement and evaluate supports for student needs including the Fullerton Collaborative, Project CONNECT, and the Wellness Advocacy Council. All three of these structures roles are explained for meeting needs of the districts most at-risk students.

The district appropriately includes parents and families of participating students in decision-making and solutions to routinely assess the applicant's progress and improve overall student health and achievement. Regular meetings are also held to analyze programs in progress and their outcomes and to collect data. The student asset data is held in another data system which also collects and discipline referral information to aid decision making to improve discipline practices adn support behavior plan design. The applicant describes a holistic approach to viewing the student's needs; academic, behavioral, health and other special needs along with parents and school support staff in addition to the student and teacher.

The applicant identifies three performance measures and briefly describes the desired results. No baseline or annual target data is provided to judge whether the targets are ambitious but achievable. This omission of this important data reduced the overall score to an otherwise thorough response.

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a coherent and comprehensive plan to build on their successfull 1:1 laptop program in place in several schools to expand to a 1:1 mobile device initiative to all district schools to personalize the education environment for each student. Additionally, the district has carefully though out and intially tested digital curriculum and data systems with teacher support to put the students in the driver seat for their education paths with full support and guidance from their teachers.

Total	210	164
-------	-----	-----



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0917CA-2 for Fullerton Elementary School District

## A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant details Project Innov<sup>∞</sup> which targets all K-8 students in the district. The applicant's stated goal is for all students will be college and career-ready and perform with excellence on the SBAC [not explained so far what SBAC is] in 2014-15. This overall objective is confusing given the population the project is addressing (K-8). If the project is funded, in 2014-15 the targeted students will only be in Grades 1-9 and so having all these students college and career-ready is not realistic.</p> <p>The plan for using the funds is set out clearly and is congruent with the four core educational assurance areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With RTT funding the district will provide all K-8 students with mobile learning devices.</li> <li>• Implement personalized online learning programs based on college and career-ready Common Core State Standards (CCSS)</li> <li>• Embed Challenge-based learning (CBL) to stimulate communication, collaboration, critical thinking and creativity</li> <li>• Provide online content to individualize learning for all students</li> <li>• Provide Professional Development for all teachers to implement the new teaching and learning methods</li> <li>• Intro a Next Generation Data System to track student learning</li> </ul> <p>While the district vision addresses creating personalized learning environments, college and career readiness for all students, data collection, and teacher PD, and it is evident and commendable that the district is already putting into practice this vision, it does not address how it will increase equity.</p> <p>The specific vision for this RTTT proposal is not clear. What is lacking is a coherent statement of where this district is now and a focused vision of how it plans to use RTT funding to extend its current good practices. The main objective of having all students college and career-ready by 2014-15 is unrealistic given the K-8 population the project targets.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This is a K-12 district in which all schools will participate the the proposed initiative. It provides no rational for selecting all schools.</p> <p>The schools are listed and grade bands provided for all schools. The total number of participating students is provided along with the total number of high needs and low income students in the district. The number of participating teachers per school is provided. Tables are provided with the breakdown per school of #s of low income and high needs students. A breakdown of high needs and low income students per grade level is not provided.</p> <p>At least one of percentages for low income students reported in the Tables does not match the actual #s provided.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan addresses all schools in this K-8 district.</p> <p>The objective of the plan is to design learning experiences for students that are 100% self-paced with teachers delivering targeted, individualized skill instruction. A description of what such a classroom would look like is provided. Students will work in collaborative groups and self-select a challenge goal of importance. Curriculum and content will be developed by district teachers in cooperation with an open source content provider. A data system will be developed to capture achievement data and guide instruction, but it is not stated when this system will be developed and by whom.</p> <p>While it describes the classroom organization, and states that teachers will develop the content and the curriculum for the, it does not describe how they will do this, the time that they will be allocated to design content. Creating high quality interactive online content is hugely time-consuming and requires high levels of knowledge and skills in instructional design. No specific timelines are provided and the responsible parties (apart from teachers) who will guide each part of the implementation are not identified. Clear and cohesive details of how the reform will be scaled up and translated into meaningful district wide reforms are not provided. The overuse of acronyms detracts from the readability of the proposal.</p>		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Performance on summative assessments. District goals are ambitious; it aims for an overall proficiency in summative assessments of 80% in 2012-13 rising to an overall proficiency of 100% by 2014-2015. Reaching 100% proficiency in math and ELA for all students is a formidable target and it is questionable if it is achievable. These improvements in learning are not disaggregated by grade or by school but seem to pertain to the whole district. The table providing projected district growth per subgroup is confusing as it projects an overall ELA proficiency rate of 100%, but proficiency rates for sub groups of less than 100% - making an overall target of 100% impossible to achieve. No model is provided as to how these proficiency numbers were calculated. For example, it is unclear as to the rationale to project 100% proficiency in math for ELL students in 2014-15, an increase of over 30% from 2011-12.</p> <p>Decreasing achievement gaps. The projections in the table indicate ambitious closure of gaps between subgroups, for example, increases of 30-35% in proficiency of Hispanic/Latino students, socio-economically disadvantaged students, ELL students and students with disabilities in ELA and 35-40% for the same groups in math. White and Asian students will be 100% proficient by 2014-15. It is questionable if these growth projections are achievable.</p> <p>Graduation rates. Graduation rates and career and college readiness are not addressed, which is a concern, as after 4 years, G8 student participants will be graduating. There is no mention of how the district tracks the graduation rates of its students after they move on to secondary school and how it will track these in the future to ascertain the impact of the RTT initiative on its students' future success. There is no mention of liaison with the secondary school to ascertain the degree of college and career-readiness with which the students enter secondary school.</p> <p>College enrollment is not mentioned.</p> <p>Post-secondary degree attainment is not mentioned.</p>		

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) It is clear that the district has piloted personalized learning environment for some of its schools and done much groundwork that is applicable to this RTT application. However, to illustrate the district's record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching the applicant focuses on three schools, and provides some evidence of success in narrative form; most of the evidence, however, is anecdotal. Lacking are data tables to record any improvement in performance of the six schools that were part of the initial project that begun in 2010. The district is in a unique situation to have piloted its program in six schools and should have baseline data from 2008-09 and 2009-10 and implementation data from 2010-11 and 2011-12 to use to provide evidence of the efficacy of the pilot in meeting the objectives.</p> <p>No concrete evidence (charts or graphs, raw student data) is provided as to the extent to which the district as a whole has improved student learning outcomes, raised student achievement, and closed achievement gaps.</p> <p>(b) The district has highlighted one school as evidence of ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools. It is not mentioned if this school was part of the 2010 pilot project. The district provides overall ELA proficiency data for this school (not disaggregated by grade but disaggregated by sub-group) for the years 2008 – 2012. Proficiency in ELA and Math rose from 2008 to 2011. The gap between sub-groups and the overall population was small in 2008, and the gap is minimal in 2011. It must be noted that the achievement of one school provides only a snapshot of one single case and may not reflect the achievement of the entire district. Missing are achievement data in Math and ELA broken down per school and per grade across the entire district.</p> <p>(c) The district currently operates a parent portal to make student performance data available to parents. It seems that currently parents can only access student data by logging on to the parent portal; this might be a drawback to access if parents do not have computers or Internet access in the home. No mention is made as to how the district currently engages parents to inform</p>		

participation and instruction.

Teachers access student data through three separate systems, Illuminate Ed, Haiku, and Power School. The district acknowledges a limitation that currently student data is distributed over three different systems. The district plans to use RTTT funding to integrate all systems into one.

It seems that Haiku LMS is being used as a part of the pilot project and affords students the ability to access grades at any time and also provides feedback and redirects students to learning content that needs to be revisited. The new piloted system, Haiku, appears to give students and teachers increased access to student achievement. It is planned to implement Haiku more extensively with RTTT funding. It is unclear as to whether Haiku is currently available to students and teachers who are not in the pilot.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section pertains to the transparency of the fiscal process at the district level and the degree to which the district makes public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration.

(a) The applicant states that the District fiscal profile is shared at board meetings three times annually, annually at the budget advisory committee, and through School Site council meetings. What is not stated is what this report contains.

(b) It is stated that actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff are listed on the FSD Personnel website and published in the newspaper. It is not stated whether the total expenditure on salaries per school is published.

(c) It is not stated whether the total expenditure per school on salaries for teachers only is published.

(d) It is not stated whether actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level are published.

In conclusion, the narrative provided a vague response with regard to transparency of budgetary procedures that did not fully provide the information required.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's narrative fails to adequately address whether successful conditions and sufficient autonomy exists under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments.

It does indicate that the Single Plan for Student Achievement adopted by the district fulfills the requirement of the ESEA to consolidate all school plans for all programs funded through the School and Library Improvement Block Grant, the Pupil retention Block Grant, the Consolidated Application, and ESEA program improvement, but does not explain how this relates to the RTTT proposal.

It does say that three to five year educational technology plans are submitted to the Superintendent and Cabinet each year and align with the district's technology use plan.

What is omitted is discussion of current state legislation regarding education and to what extent the successful implementation of the RTTT proposal is impacted positively or negatively by it.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Meaningful Stakeholder Engagement.

No description is provided as to how students were engaged in the formulation and revision of the RTTT proposal. With regard to parents, it is stated that the district PTA was also involved in the long-term grassroots development of the RTTT proposal, but no details are provided as to what its involvement entailed.

The description of how teachers were engaged in actually formulating and revising the RTTT proposal is unclear although

there has been involvement over the last two years of one teacher from each school on a committee that is developing construct a teacher evaluation system for principals and teacher that involves student achievement data. All principals were also part of the committee, however, no evidence is provided into how principals were engaged in the formulation and revision of the RTT proposal. The extent to which stakeholders actually were engaged in the development of the proposal is unclear, although evidence is provided as to teacher and principal engagement in formulating components that are part of the proposal including a teacher and principal evaluation system that will be piloted this year. These components were underway before the announcement of the district Race to the Top competition.

The applicant states that leadership from Fullerton Elementary Teachers' Association and California School Employees Association were involved in the long-term development of Project Innov<sup>∞</sup>.

(b) Letters of support

A large number of detailed letters of support from key stakeholders - one parent organization, the teacher association, institutions of higher education, local civic and community-based organizations, members of the Health and Wellness councils, the business community, and the police department. Letters of support are also provided from the vendors of the various systems that the district plans to purchase. No letters of support are provided from students or student organizations or from individual parents. This may be because there is no evidence beyond the PTA of the applicant seeking input from the general student and parent body.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Some details of the structures that are currently in place are provided to implement personalized learning environments are provided. Evidence of a well-structured PD plan for teachers to create teacher leaders is clear. A certificate program for is provided which is revised frequently with teacher feedback. However, there is no evidence of a high quality plan to analyze the district's current status with regard to implementing personalized learning environments. No plans to collect data to establish the current status are provided and thus no evidence is provided of needs and gaps, except for a statement that the gap is that 65% of classrooms require to have students provided with one on one computing devices 24/7 , 85% of teaching staff require PD and the data system needs to be developed.

The applicant provides no evidence of the steps the district has taken to ascertain where the gaps lie in student educational achievement for example gaps between high and low income students, gaps between Black, White and Hispanic students, and no longitudinal analysis of student achievement data to skills in which students have deficits. No evidence is provided as to how the district has analyzed its status in implementing personalized learning environments. In conclusion, a high quality plan that assesses needs and addresses achievement gaps is not evident.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a)

(i) The plan states it provides students with a unique collaborative personalized learning network that gives opportunity for students to interact with teachers and collaborate with global community members to witness success. What is absent is any mention of the role of parents and educators in helping students understand what they are learning is connected to their goals.

(ii) There is no mention in the applicant's narrative of how students will identify the learning and development goals they want to achieve, the role of parents and educators in supporting students to identify their goals, and the specific actions teachers, in conjunction with parents, will take to ensure that students pursue their goals.

(iii) The applicant provides a clear example of one instance in which students were involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest; what is absent is how parents and teachers will ensure all learners are involved in deep learning experiences.

(iv) The applicant provides an example of a 20 year district Arts initiative. What is absent is how the implementation of project Innov<sup>∞</sup> will provide students access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning.

(v) While the plan states that students will gain the skills of collaboration, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving, what it fails to do is explain how parents and educators will work together to ensure within the technological infra-structure of Project Innov<sup>∞</sup> students master critical academic content and develop skills.

(b)

(i) The applicant states that a cadre of district teachers is leading the way to author content for students that will provide a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals through remediation and acceleration. Authoring quality interactive content is time-consuming and requires high-levels of skill in online curriculum design. There is no mention of the role of parents in the process.

(ii) The applicant's narrative focuses on the creating of a new data system and what it will provide. There is no description of a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments or the role of teachers and parents in ensuring this occurs.

(iii) High quality content: It is stated that teachers will create the content and the level of quality will be evaluated using student data. No guarantee of the quality of the quality is provided.

(iv) Ongoing and regular feedback:

A. Benchmark data loaded in Illuminate allow teachers to see specific student achievement data. There is no mention of how teachers use these data to communicate and provide feedback to students regarding personalized learning recommendations and achievement of their goals., nor is any mention made of the role of parents.

It is stated that when the new data system is in place RtI2 data will be integrated, which will guide interventions. However, there is no mention of whether intensive RtI2 training will be provided to teachers in all schools beyond the two schools now targeted. The new data system funded by RTTT funding should provide improved access to data that will allow teachers to identify students needs.

(v) Accommodations: The applicant details several of accommodations that are currently in place for ELL students and a program geared towards G7 lower income students and families to provide support in preparing for college.

(c) Training and support for students: Currently 'Rollout' evenings are in place to provide training and support to students and their families that ensure that they understand how to use the laptops and the Haiku data management system to track and manage their learning. In addition, there is a district technical repair center which, through the RTTT funding, will employ additional technicians to provide rapid response to student technology issues. Item C is fully met.

In conclusion, with regard to Learning, for many of the criteria, the applicant provides details of what is currently present as well as anecdotal examples of the criterion, without providing a quality plan for the use of The RTTT funding to create engaging learning environments. There is an underlying assumption that the current practices will be continued within the RTTT plan. It states that teachers will develop the content and the curriculum for the implementation, but it does not describe how they will do this, or provide a timeframe for this to occur. The role of parents in the approach to learning is not addressed. Clear and cohesive details of how the RTTT plan will translated be into meaningful district wide reforms are not provided.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

15

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Educator training; while educator training has been mentioned frequently in the proposal detailing the opportunities for PD, in particular the current practices in place for early release Wednesdays, the plan does not clearly set out clearly what PD activities will be offered, a timeframe for training to occur nor specify who will do the training, how it will occur or how the professional teams or communities will be structured.

(i) It has been stated that digital content will be developed by a cadre of teachers who have gained the district certificate. No mention is made as to how the rest of the teachers will be provided support to increase their capacity to provide high quality digital content. It is stated that PLC time will be used for teachers to discuss their challenges and successes. Dialogue will be documented and used to provide suggestions for teaching the unit next year. However, details of formal training in implementing personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs are absent.

- (ii) It is unclear what support and training will be provided to teachers to adapt content and instruction and provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, interests, and optimal learning approaches.
- (iii) Although it is mentioned that the new data system implemented will provide a system for monitoring with RTTT funding, the plan is vague regarding the activities and timelines it will use to frequently measure student progress and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators.
- (iv) The applicant has identified that the district is in the process of developing new principal and teacher evaluation tools which will include measures of student growth. It hopes to pilot the evaluation system in 2012-13. Details are provided of the process by which these evaluations will be conducted and reported, but not on how the tool will be used to improve teacher and principal effectiveness.
- (b) The district will use PLC time (early closure once per month) for teacher collaboration time to discuss early response to individual student needs. It is stated that RTTT funding will be used for teachers to receive training in individualized student learning. No specifics are provided of when this training will occur, who will conduct, what activities it will involve and who are the parties responsible for providing it.
- (i) No mention is made of specific actions that will help educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests;
- (ii) Content software will be provided by several different commercial vendors and by teachers. The quality of teacher developed digital content will be evaluated by how well students achieve in the particular curricular areas the content addresses. The new data-management system developed with RTTT funds will have the capacity to link student achievement to specific content areas. If students achieve at high levels the content will be deemed high quality. Such an approach may be problematic, however, as it fails to take into account the actions of specific teachers as they teach that content. Content itself cannot empower learners, while the way in which content is delivered can.
- (iii) (c) The district currently has a certificate program for its teachers with courses offered once a month after school on professional practice and technology use. Teachers who gain this certificate are promoted into instructional leadership roles. It is unclear the extent to which these courses relate to the RTTT project and personalized learning environments, and the role these individuals will play in the RTTT implementation process. Also planned is a principal certificate called Leaders of Innovation. Principals will visit different schools once a month to observe how teachers use mobile devices in their classrooms and in turn implement successful strategies in their schools.
- In conclusion, the plan lacks specific details of the training systems and practices and specific goals for improving student performance. It is vague with respect to how it will build a school and district culture and climate focused on continuous improvement through a focus on personalized learning environments.

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states that policies are in place to promote the compacting of curriculum and allow students to demonstrate mastery, but does not provide specific details of the content of these policies. Support will be provided to staff through weekly early release.</p> <p>It is clearly stated that schools have autonomy over school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and to school-level budgets in the ways that best meet student needs of students, for example tutoring and after school programs.</p> <p>It is clearly stated that teachers will create flexible classroom environments in which students will have the opportunity to progress based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. Students will have multiple chances to demonstrate mastery. This will happen by means of the new LMS that will be implemented with RTTT funding.</p> <p>It is stated that the district has a full continuum of resources to support students with disabilities and that teachers ensure accommodations are in place. In addition technology is widely used to support learning needs With regard to ELL students, the district will build on past success with one-on-one devices to engage and inspire ELL students. The district will provide training to address the specific needs for students with disabilities and ELL students.</p>		



Although the details regarding district policy are vague, the applicant has clearly described high quality practices, support and resources that are sufficient to with regard to meeting students' individual needs.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a clear picture of the resources that are already in place. The district is in the process of significant network upgrades to improve speed and access by 2013-2014. These up-grades will support one-on-one computing for all students.

The new LMS system will allow teachers, students and parents access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school. It is not clear, however, whether students will be able to take their computers home after school. The district is currently negotiating low-cost Internet services for low income families.

With regard to technology support, through RTTT funding additional site technology support providers will be hired (no details of how many) and a student "Genius Bar" taskforce provided. This group will help fellow classmates and teachers with in-class technical support – an innovative and empowering approach for students. Additional help-desk staff will be hired through the RTTT funding to provide 24/7 support. Twice a month, a family technology support evening will be held on campus. The district also plans to create technology roadshows to inform the community regarding the success of the project.

RTTT funding will allow the district to integrate the three data systems it has in use now into one. This process will allow interoperability among the three systems. No information is provided as to whether the new data system will allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems.

In conclusion, although details about the numbers of support staff who will be employed are vague, the district appears to have a plan in place to provide infrastructure and support to implement personalized learning environments. Apart from the new data system, no time-line is provided for the project.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has outlined a rigorous data collection process with multiple data sources for the first year of the program that will measure the success of the project objectives. It is stated that data will be collected every year of the project with a report provided annually. The evaluation team will report findings monthly to the project team so that they can use them for improvement and to make revisions during implementation..</p> <p>It is clear that a robust plan is in place to monitor and measure progress and provide rigorous feedback to the project team on a regular basis. What is omitted is the process by which the project team will use this information to guide revisions and adjustments to the implementation and how the project team will publicly share the information on the quality of its investments funded by RTTT.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>With respect to collecting data and stakeholder feedback regarding the effectiveness of the implementation, the applicant has clearly identified several ways in which the grant evaluation team will collect data from internal and external stakeholders, including interviews and focus groups. Absent is an approach by which the district will communicate to and to engage stakeholders in the findings of the evaluation team.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Although the applicant has provided a detailed evaluation plan, and a rationale for the selection of the performance measures is inherent in the plan and throughout the proposal, the applicant has provided no details as to how the</p>		

data will be used to review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided no information in this category.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) It is stated that this project is an extension of a project the district already has underway. A breakdown of the funds (\$) amount) that will be used to support this project is provided, including district funds redirected from other sources to support the RTTT project.</p> <p>b. The costs appear sufficient for the most part. However, it is questionable, if two additional support technicians will have the capacity to maintain over 17,000 additional computing devices and no mention in the budget is made of staff to man the Helpline. It is assumed that the district is absorbing the costs of developing the new teacher and principal evaluation systems currently underway. Apart from the the query about adequate technical/helpline support, the proposed expendidture should be sufficient to complete the project. With regard to being reasonable, the applicant fails to make a strong case as to why grade 5-8 students need access to not only one-on-one computing (MacBooks) but also to iPads.</p> <p>(c) (i) A description of all of the funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal, including total revenue from these sources is provided.</p> <p>(ii)The information provided for the most part specifies which funds will be used for one-time investments and versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period. However, it fails to specify that replacement computers will be a continuing cost after implementation of the program and the completion of the RTTT grant. As it appears the district will implement the RTTT project in all schools and in all classrooms at the same time, by the end of the grant period, these will be due to be replaced.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	6
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The fact that the district has a strong commitment to professional development and to growing its own instructional leaders is a positive factor in the sustainability of this project; however, even although all staff will become trained in implementing personalized learning environments during the grant period, the matter of staff turnover has not been addressed and staff new to the district will required PD in this area. As the district ackonowledges curriculum is not stagnant and will need to be revised according to students needs. It will retain one curriculum developer for three years after the grant is over.</p> <p>The area in which the plan is vague is how it will continue to provide new computers. A four-year at the most cycle seems to be the norm, and so after this RTTT grant is over, the computers purchased with RTTT funds will need to be replaced. No time line is evident for replacing domputers. Although several possible solutions are proposed, no concrete funding sources are described. Proposed csolutions include omputer leasing (which will still be costly), alternative vendor purchase plans, and bring your own device- a solution which is not realistic for low income students. Additionally, only one of the technology specialists will be retained making it extremely difficult to maintain functionability of the large number of devices in use. Further no mention is made about how the cost of software licencings and the purchase of the new programs.</p> <p>A high quality plan for sustainabilty of the RTTT project is not fully evident. No goals are provided for continuation, and no timeline for the replacement of hardware nor firm deatils of how it will be funded..</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a description of linkages it has formed with several public and private organizations and other community-based organizations. The extent to which most can be called sustainable partnerships is questionable as the term partnership implies two-way interaction, while most of the organizations detailed only provide funds to the district for project. While the connection with the Fullerton Collaborative may be more of a partnership, few details are provided as to how the two work together.

What the applicant plans to do with its collaborators extends Project INNOV project and extends beyond programs that are already in existence, although no clear goals for family and community supports are provided.

The applicant has identified three population-level desired results for students in the LEA that align with and support the applicant's broader Race to the Top – District proposal. The first outcome is that all socially-disadvantaged students will be college and career ready, an objective that may relate more to a district serving a secondary student population than one serving K-8, however it is an admirable aim. It is unclear as to whether the each of the desired results indicated pertain to the three groups of students targeted or if one result pertains to each group.

While the applicant has detailed how the partnership would track the selected indicators at the student level for the participating students, it is unclear how the indicators relate to the outcomes and also how some of the Competitive Preference Priority outcomes differ or extend those of the RTTT project itself. It is unclear how the partnership would, within participating schools integrate education and other services address social-emotional, and behavioral needs for participating students

In conclusion, the plan cannot be describes as high quality as it fails to provide details of achievable and measurable goals, what specific activities it will provide, a timeline, deliverables and parties responsible.

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has addressed how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards ,accelerate student achievement ,and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student;

Total	210	141
-------	-----	-----



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0917CA-3 for Fullerton Elementary School District

## A. Vision (40 total points)

--	--	--

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Fullerton School District's Race to the Top Proposal, titled Project Innovate (Innov), was designed to serve the District's 13,825 Transitional Kindergarten to 8th grade students. The Proposal set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas and articulated a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. Innov identified its vision as "Educating today's students to be tomorrow's leaders."</p> <p>The project's primary goal was that "all Fullerton School District (FSD) students will be college- and career-ready and perform with excellence on the SBAC in 2014-2015." Innov earned high points for articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. The vision identified in the proposal incorporated all the requirements of this criterion. Work in three of the four core assurance areas was explicit in the program benefits noted below. Turning around low-performing schools was integrated in all the six benefits of the program noted below. As will be shown in other sections, FSD has had remarkable success in turning around low-performing schools and raising the proficiencies of at-risk students.</p> <p>The proposal envisioned that implementation of Innov resulted in the following benefits for students and teachers in the district:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Personalized online learning programs based upon college- and career-ready Common Core State Standards (CCSS);</li> <li>• Ubiquitous 1:1 mobile learning devices for all learners;</li> <li>• Embedded authentic Challenge Based Learning (CBL) activities that boost creativity, communication, critical thinking, and collaboration and result in a lasting change to the student's world;</li> <li>• Next Generation Data System (NGDS) to inform and assess that ensures the highest levels of student achievement and success;</li> <li>• Predictive online content to meet individualized learning for all students;</li> <li>• Systematic professional development coaching and professional development supporting all teachers to excel in teaching within Project Innov's digital learning environment."</li> </ul>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Project Innov earned high points for its approach to implementation. In its selection of participating schools, the proposal was inclusive in that all Transitional Kindergarten (TK) thru 8<sup>th</sup> grade students and teachers in the district were included. The list of the schools and their demographics was found in the proposal. The documentation showed that 13,656 students would be served and that 40.7% of the students were identified as low-income. That percentage barely met the minimum of 40% required for RTTD participation.</p> <p>In its implementation, Innov expected to implement the mobile devices in three phases. They will use the initial grade level in each grade band so that the Kindergarten will implement first in the K-2 band, the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade in the 3-5 band, the 6<sup>th</sup> grade in the 6-8 band. The rationale for that decision was "that it would be very difficult for students to use devices for a year and then have to experience the classroom without technology if their next grade level." Project Innov had a creditable approach for the training and professional development necessary for introducing the use of technology. It noted that one of every four teachers had already been highly trained and that those teachers would be used to provide assistance through co-teaching and mentoring opportunities. The project was not as explicit on how support on technology content would be provided.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Innov earned high points for the way it addressed LEA-wide reform and change. Because all students and teachers in the district were included in the proposal, Innov met the expectation that the project translate into meaningful reform to support district-wide change. Innov provided a logic model and theory of change for how its plan would improve student learning outcomes for all students. The explanations and materials provided the necessary data and explanations for how reform and change would take place across the three phases of implementation. Innov's model of change of how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served by the applicant was firmly rooted in research and best practices.</p>		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Project Innov earned high points for its efforts for improved student outcomes. The Fullerton Elementary School District (FSD) has been involved in school reform efforts that are heavily technology infused and served as foundations for the proposed Innov project. Those efforts appear reasonably successful. The data included in the proposal showed that FSD had existing proficiency levels that were relatively high. Overall over two-thirds of students were meeting in language arts proficiency standards and nearly three-fourths of students were meeting math standards.</p> <p>FSD showed higher existing scores for socio-economically disadvantaged students than many districts. Charts showed that 48.4% of socio-economically disadvantaged students were meeting proficiency standards in language arts and 58.35% were meeting math proficiency standards. Asian students had over 90% proficiency scores in both language arts and mathematics. The most troubling statistics were the proficiency gaps for Hispanic students who had 50.1 proficiency in language arts and 59.3 in mathematics as compared to the overall 67.5% in language arts and 73.2% in mathematics. The proposal provided numerous interventions that had been underway in the past few years and noted that the results of those interventions were quite encouraging in that they had reduced the achievement gaps every year. Because FSD is an elementary district, graduation and college participation statistics were not given.</p>		

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	15
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>FSD earned high points on demonstrating a clear track record of success in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching, including a description, charts or graphs, raw student data, and other evidence that demonstrates the applicant's ability. FSD has demonstrated evidence of success on the California Academic Performance Index (API) that showed growth from a District API of 798 in 2007 to 867 in 2012. They noted that sustained improvement over time was evident as a district and in three different diverse settings within the District. They attributed the increases to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology-rich environments that support personalized learning</li> <li>• College- and career-ready learning standards</li> <li>• Twenty-first Century teaching and learning that embodies critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity</li> <li>• Comprehensive accountability system</li> <li>• Learning interventions such as Response to Intervention(RtI)</li> <li>• Multi-tiered professional development and Professional Learning Communities (PLC)</li> <li>• An actively involved and supportive community</li> </ul> <p>Very remarkable was the increased levels of proficiency of certain populations during the past five years. In a high-need school undergoing a "turn-around model" intervention, the intensive technology school (Valencia Parks) shows Hispanic students going 28% proficient in 2008 to 55% proficient in language arts and 36% to 70% proficient in mathematics. Similar growth was documented for special education and language learners at that school. The proposal indicated that all three high-need schools required undergoing "turn-around" interventions dramatically improved.</p> <p>FSD provided student performance data to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. Educators were able to evaluate student achievement data in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Illuminate Ed, a data warehouse system</li> <li>• Haiku LMS that follows a child's progress on classroom assignments and work</li> <li>• Student Information System (SIS) PowerSchool</li> </ul> <p>For families, the District provides:</p>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent portal that provides students and parents information about student achievement on classroom assignments available in the SIS grade book.</li> <li>• Haiku LMS provides access for parents to create accounts and view their child's progress on classroom</li> <li>• Curriculum and instruction descriptions</li> <li>• Fiscal and expenditure data including salary information.</li> <li>• Adequate yearly progress (AYP) of students in achieving state academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• Title 1 Program Improvements</li> <li>• School Accountability Report Cards (SARC)</li> <li>• Status of “highly qualified” teachers teaching core academic subjects, “miss-assignments” and vacant teacher position</li> <li>• Availability of “sufficient textbooks and other instructional materials”.</li> </ul>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Innov earned high points for its high levels of transparency in LEA processes, practices and investments. The comments in (B)(1) listed the many ways FSD shared information with parents, students and the community. Additional transparency was provided through teacher web pages. The district also made available reports from FSD departments and leaders and from District organizations like the Parents and Teachers Association (PTA).</p> <p>An noted in (B)(1) All of FSD's salaries, for both certificated and classified staff, are listed on the FSD Personnel website. For those wishing to get their information in a print format, the local newspaper published the same salary information. The item that was likely most read was the SARC. It was updated annually and included detailed information about each school in a more convenient format that the larger district reports. FSD also held many in-person meetings such as Board of Education and PTA meetings.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Innov earned medium points for describing the State context for implementation. Proposal writers seemed to have misunderstood the complete intent of criterion (B)(3). Instead of discussions about any legal limitations imposed by the State Legislature or the State Board, they documented that the proposes RTTD program was an expansion and elaboration of pilot schools that had proven extremely successful. In providing those examples, they showed that the proposed work had encountered no obstacles in implementing the personalized learning environments described in the proposal. It also demonstrated that FSD had the conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments envision in RTTD proposal..</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Innov earned high points for stakeholder engagement and support. The proposal described numerous meetings and very extensive communications with students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools and their communities. They developed support from major corporations, civic groups and their education constituents. The proposal did not provide examples of how those involvement resulted in additions or changes to their proposal.</p> <p>The proposal had fifty letters of support from a variety of organizations and group ranging from major corporations to school councils. The letters of support from the collective bargaining representatives of teachers and administrators were very positive and unconditionally supportive of the proposal. The letter from Sherry Hoyt the President of the Fullerton Elementary Teachers Association was especially noteworthy for the strong commitment to make the project successful Also very impressive were the large numbers of letters from higher education officials.. Clearly Innov did an exemplary job of obtaining stakeholder engagement and support even though it did not report what changes they incorporated when writng the proposal.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Innov earned low points for it analysis of needs and gaps. Proposal writers used this criterion to highlight strengths instead of providng information about a needs analysis. They did talk about the need for more technology, professional development and</p>		

a more sophisticated data system but opportunities to analyze areas of need in curriculum and instruction were lost. Also lost were opportunities to examine needs and gaps from the perspective of their stakeholders. Two points were given because in other parts of the proposal, they actually had more analysis of needs and gaps than they did in this section.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	20
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Innov earned high points because it has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. FSD noted in this section and in (C)(2) that it had been implementing most of the expectations envisioned in the RTTD program for nine years. In those nine years, FSD learned how to implement instructional strategies that accelerated learning for all students including those that come from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds. The proposal stated that view more elegantly in the following manner. "The logic behind <b>Project Innov</b> is to build upon a research-based, successful working model by maximizing and enhancing in-district human and capital resources. A framework for systematic professional development, student data and learning management systems, and the principal and teacher evaluation redesign are in place to ensure accountability for student achievement and the highest quality teachers and site administrators."</p> <p>FSD, in its proposal, documented some very significant increases in learning when using individualized, technology intensive learning strategies that focused on Challenge-Based Learning (CBL). Research showed that CBL learning motivated students because there were multi-day activities that focused on real-world problems and concerns that could be best solved through working in teams. Those teams maximized critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving, CBL also, allowed formative assessments that provided feedback to help students better understand the need to strengthen their knowledge, learning skills and use of tools.</p> <p>FSD has developed a working approach that empowered all learners to succeed. Because this kind of learning allowed students to be successful in school, they used that confidence, knowledge and skills to prepare for and succeed in college work and careers.</p> <p>In summary, FSD was and will plan to use an approach to learning that engaged and empowered all learners, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner. Students understand the value of education for accomplishing their goals be they college or career preparation. Technology-intensive, personalized learning utilizing CBL strategies allows them to have deep learning and access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives. The use of Five E assessments (explained in the next section) and the districts use of sophisticated data systems allowed them to achieve individual goals and graduation requirements. FSD provided evidence with its test scores that they had high-quality strategies for high-needs student that made them successful. It, also, provided evidence that it had teachers and students working at very high levels of technology and resource use.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	19
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Innov earned high points for teaching and leading because it had a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. The proposal was excellent in explaining how personalization of learning will be ensured. They explained that "each child will have an <b>Innov<sup>ation</sup> Education Plan (I<sup>EP</sup>)</b> that will include personalized college and career goals, learning style, level of mastery on CCSS, ELL needs as well as interests or hobbies. Using the NGDS, the <b>I<sup>EP</sup></b> will be updated dynamically each time the students or teachers use the system. Because learning will be the constant for all students, children who need more time within a unit of study on a concept, skill or standard will be given additional opportunities and curriculums in order for all students to master standards and ensure students are on track to graduate on time."</p> <p>RTTD proposals were required to address frequent measures of student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress. GBL learning required seeing learning and teaching in a different way than most of us learned. The proposal also was excellent in explaining the structure that helped teachers interface meeting state standards and providing instruction through CBL activities. It also addressed questions about formative and summative assessments of student's work and the relationship of those assessments to state curriculum standards. Understanding CBL lessons was so important for understanding project Innov that a sample lesson is included in the reviewer's comments. A summary of the Five E model also was included because it showed how curriculum content,</p>		

instruction strategies and assessment are selected and integrated for a CBL activity. The following lesson uses CBL and the five Es to structure an in-depth learning opportunity. The following lesson was structured through the use of the Five Es.

“Engagement- What is the Big Idea and what are some essential research questions? What are examples of renewable energy and non-renewable energy? What is the new vocabulary? The teacher uses video clips and short readings to describe both topics. At the end of the unit, students will need to argue their point as to which energy source should be pursued as a future source of energy for the world.

Exploration- Students are asked to find additional resources, using their mobile devices to research and define the different energies. Students connect with experts in the energy field through Skype or Face Time. Groups of students collaborate to decide which energy source they would like to focus on. The teacher is able to work with small groups of students to facilitate thinking and ask guiding questions to further or expand the group's thinking.

Explanation- Students present to the group, using the presentation tool that they choose for example, iMovie, Keynote, Prezzie, iBooks Author, or whatever they choose to show the class why their energy source is the best to encourage further research. Feedback from peers is included in this section

Elaboration- Students will take the feedback from their peers and the instructor and now put their ideas out to the science community. Using FSD's partnerships with Raytheon, students will receive authentic feedback from actual scientists and engineers to further question and expand their thinking. Time for adjustments to the students' presentations will be given and the students will now be ready to turn in their final product.

Evaluation- The teacher will meet with each student group to present their final presentations and be given a score on the rubric. In addition to the teacher and classmates, students may also be required to present their project and its outcomes to experts from the community, colleges, or business related industries, local or worldwide via Skype. As part of the evaluation process, students will be required to document the development of their project, its outcomes, and reflect on their practices and next steps by keeping a videolog. Questions may include: are their implications for further research? What did they learn about themselves working collaboratively as a group? What are the best tools for learning?

The section also earned high points because it was apparent the proposal writers were very familiar with the research on effective professional development. They designed multiple strategies for sharing with all teachers the research, its implementation implications and the likely impact on student learning. FSD has moved CBL instructions to new heights with the additional work they have done on standards-based instruction and student assessments.

There were many forms of professional development opportunities noted in the proposal that are found in other exemplary districts. However there were some interesting professional development opportunities that were very interesting for using 5E strategies in adult learning. Those opportunities were called “certificate” courses and were very different from typical professional development because of their emphasis on solving real work problems and developing strategies for sharing learning with colleagues so that the numbers and quality of effective teachers and principals would be enhanced. Very likely the impressive gains FSD has shown for students using CBL strategies were responsible for the districts increased abilities of their teachers and leaders.

There was considerable information about principal evaluation systems in Appendix R and it was high quality because it showed instruments actually used at FSD. The principal evaluation appeared to meet RTTD requirements. One point was deducted because information about teacher evaluation was very minimal. They did indicate that they were using a system developed in 2002 based upon the California Standards for the Teaching Profession(CSTP) and that a new system would be developed next year.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
Innov earned high points for LEA practices and rules even though the proposal did not provide information about the central office and how it was organized. The high score was justified because of the excellence of the other components in this criterion.		
FSD documented how they provided flexibility in the how of student learning even as they expected all teachers and students to address and succeed in achieving core standards required by the district and the state. There was considerable site-based management and most decisions were made by committees of administrators and teachers who provided students, parents		



and community members with opportunities to make recommendations about what should be learned. FSD was unique in how proactively they involved the community in creating real life learning opportunities and how they use community members as knowledge sources and mentors.

Great detail was provided in the previous section about how FSD allowed students to demonstrate mastery at multiple time and in multiple ways. Also discussed in the previous section how the Challenge-Based Learning (CBL) with its five E guiding questions provided the flexibility to adapt activities for all students including those with disabilities and English Learners.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

10

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Innov earned high points for LEA and school infrastructure. The proposal provided great detail on the levels of FSD student's present access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources in both "lap-top and non-laptop schools. Innov noted the hardware, connectivity and support technology such as white board that was and would available before and after Innov. There was little doubt that FSD schools already had more technology than most schools. Even more detail was provided for how much richer the content, tool and other learning resources would be in the future for participating Innov student if the Innov proposal was funded. The proposal had additional information in this and other sections about the many intensive supports that will be available to participating students, teachers and community members. Those have been described in other criterion comments. New information was provided on how immediate support would be provided for problems that suddenly occurred while classes were underway.

The proposal indicated that support would be provided through three levels.

- District online support with videos, documentation, and screencasts
- Student "Genius Bar" program that utilized students trained to assist fellow classmates and teachers with in-class technical support
- District staff trained to provide direct support to classroom teachers and students on an on-call-basis with the expectation that they would either fix the problem or replace the equipment or software immediately.

For parents, the district will provide parent informational evenings, "Labmercials". that provide parents the pedagogical reasoning behind technology- intensive CBL learning and opportunities to interact with educational technology in the same way their children use that technology. The proposal indicated that they were using and will use information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format. The system securely stored personal records with personal identifiers and passwords.

The proposal indicated that the Next Generation Data System (NGDS) had the potential to provide the following open source data to parents across multiple platforms:.

- Individualized learning content
- Pertinent student data
- Achievement levels on Common CoreState Standards (CCSS) assessments
- Benchmarks,
- Summary data regarding student progress toward standards mastery
- Suggested curriculum to promote individualized learning .

Innov also ensured use of interoperable data systems. Specifically they were using "Open Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP). "This service creates the user accounts that allow the system to share data between programs such as the SIS, LMS, Data, Food, Email, Transportation, et al."

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Innov earned high points for it continuous improvement process as detailed in the evaluation plan. The plan had an excellent design and appropriate guiding questions The evaluation will be conducted by California State University, Fullerton and the plan was written By Dr. Dawn Person, California State University, Fullerton

A summary of the plan showed that it was structured to study short and long term goals and outcomes for students, teachers,

the schools, and school district. The evaluation plan was designed to consider program implementation, program process, and program outcomes to determine program effectiveness. The primary evaluation questions were the following:

- “What components of the proposed plan have been successfully implemented?
- How is the project being managed and what is the leadership approach and style to support project effectiveness including communication within schools, across school sites, and with community partners and administrators within the district and program facilitators?
- How do students and teachers describe their experiences with the project and what evidence is there of project implementation, and impact on teaching and learning in the schools?
- What evidence is there of institutionalization of the program?”

The plan had a wealth of detail and covered many pages of excellent information. The excellence of the evaluation plan and how it will help with the continuous improvement process was clearly apparent. Technology will be used as much as possible in the evaluation process using online surveys and in some cases online chat rooms for focus group interviews. How successful those evaluation gathering strategies will be of great interest to other evaluators. The cost of the evaluation was high (\$400,000) but because Project Innov had the potential for very high visibility and external interest, the expenditure and the extensiveness of the evaluation were justified. The sharing of information about the success or problems of Project Innov will be of high interest outside the district. Points were deducted because there was no discussion of how the information will be shared publicly inside and outside the district. Given how FSD has noted in other sections, its many efforts to share information that omission will likely not be an implementation issue.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Innov earned medium points for ongoing communication and engagement. The proposal had information on how information will be shared with decision-makers. Information was not available on how information will be shared externally though one can assume that the other rich strategies for information sharing noted in other sections of the proposal will be utilized for this purpose.</p> <p>The evaluation plan had both formative and summative assessments. Evaluators will provide formative assessment results through monthly meetings and reports. The summative assessments will be reported through annual reports that “include a detailed reporting of project activities and review of project outcomes with an independent data collection and analyses of project impact on students and teachers. Monthly meetings and the annual report will include discussion of recommendations for program improvement.”</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Innov earned zero points because required information on this criterion was not provided in the proposal.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Innov earned low points because required information on this criterion was minimal for evaluating the effectiveness of district funded activities related to professional development and the improved use of technology. There was no information on working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedules and structures.</p>		

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Innov earned high points for its budget for the project. The budget provided strong rationale for all the expenditures and they appeared reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. The reviewer did not understand what “payroll tax burdens” were under fringe benefits” but assumed that was standard heading under California law. The budget earned maximum points for the following reasons:</p>		

- The proposal identified all funds that will support the project showing that \$14,440,730 were RTTD funds and \$500,000 were funds from other sources.
- Budgets were identified by program and function.
- The amounts were reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal.
- The budget clearly provided a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities.
- Identification was made of the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period, as described in the proposed budget and budget narrative.
- The budgets provided focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Innov earned high points for its analysis of the components of the project that they would sustained after the project ended. The arguments that considerable of the professional development and database development were expenditures that naturally could be reduced was compelling. It was realistic that many of the hardware purchases would be less in the future as they would be sequential replacements instead of immediate purchases made sense. Also probably accurate were the claims that iPads would require less maintenance because they had fewer moving parts than equipment with hard drives and more mechanical keyboards and maintenance costs would be lower. Most compelling was the realistic external source funding they would continue to get based upon historical precedence. Project Innov had a lot of external partners who were very supportive of long term partnerships and contributions. In conclusion, proposal writers were convincing in their belief that through careful modifications of district expenditure, a slimmer Project Innov would continue.

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Project Innov's competitive preference priority earned medium points.. The proposal provided a description of the coherent and sustainable partnership that was formed with public and private organizations working under a collaborative organization called the Fullerton Collaborative. The mission of the Fullerton Collaborative is "to build and support a healthy community for all." The Collaborative received funding from Three district foundations (Fullerton Technology Foundation (FTF), Fullerton Education Foundation (FEF), All the Arts for All the Kids (AAAK)) collectively give over \$200,000 annually that goes directly to support FSD students and teachers with educational technology, learning showcases, and creative expression. Two other contributors are the Phelps Family Foundation and the Fullerton chapter of the Assistance League Professional Humanitarian Auxiliary (ALPHA). The Wilson W. Phelps Foundation, family members contributed over \$1.5 million in the last four years to support educational technology and Challenge Based Learning (CBL) in FSD classrooms. Alpha contributed 1,500 hours of volunteer work worth over \$95,000.

Innov's competitive priority had three population-level desired results for students in FSD. The three results were:

"1. Students will be college- and career ready with 21st C learning skills communication, collaboration, creativity, critical thinking: e.g., Laptop scholarships, access to PBS SoCal Discovery Education, Haiku LMS, Gizmos to all students, Arts LAB Busses for movie-making and composing music, in district Creativity Center, Challenge Based Learning, Co-Teach program

2. Students will embody Health, Wellness, and Nutrition to be ready to learn: e.g., Operation School Bell/clothing school supplies, Dental and Vision clinics, St. Jude's Healthy Lifestyles program/Obesity, A-Z SaladBar, Lunchtime Exercise Action Program(LEAP), Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS)

3. Parents will be able to understand and navigate "school life skills" to be college- and career-ready: e.g., parent conferences, report cards, assessments, homework, 40 Developmental Assets, Ten Commandments for Parent Education, Gang and Drug Awareness/Safe Community Partnership (CalGRIP Grant), PBIS, District English."

Because the competitive priority was using the districts data systems, it had a wealth of resource to track all required information. The competitive priority proposal experienced problems with the remainder of the requirements. Its response to

strategies for scaling the model were limited to district expansion and that response was that the program as envisioned would be large enough to meet the needs of the district.

Because the performance indicators were so general, the specifics of how they would know the program was successful left much to be desired in determining success. Also problematic was the non-existence of base information for desired results 2 and 3.

The proposal's most serious deficit was the responses to management issues. The proposal very much needed an action plan that identified tasks, specific performance indicators for each task, people responsible, timelines, management structures and decision making processes. Those were not apparent and because of the confusion, the project appeared to be in early stages of planning.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
<p>FSD coherently and comprehensively addressed how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements. It did so effectively and with some sections associated with learning quite brilliantly.</p> <p>Because so much of this proposal is actually being implemented already, it was able to prove it could accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. The work it did with the turn-around schools is remarkable.</p> <p>The proposal however had its low moments. It failed to provide required performance measure indicators and evaluation of effectiveness. Its competitive preference priority did not have the high quality of writing found in other sections of the proposal.</p> <p>In conclusion, this proposal would almost certainly succeed if funded. It has such a strong base of success that it can ramp up its momentum to become a national model. This proposal should be funded if the proposal reaches the necessary levels of competitive points.</p>		
Total	210	181